Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. 112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. More specifically, the Examiner has objected to the recitation of "for video decompression".

The attention of the Examiner is called to page 3, lines 2 and 3 of the instant specification, and to elements 6 and 8 of the instant drawing. The specification specifically states

"To decompress the MPEG stream, the MPEG decoder 6 is connected via a data bus to a video RAM 8".

Elements 6 and 8 are clearly shown in the drawing. Furthermore, Page 1, lines 10-12, of the instant specification, recites that such a decoder circuit uses a so-called video RAM (random access memory) to retain data which are processed, for instance, to decompress an MPEG stream. It is therefore clear that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 is overcome.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-2 and 4-11 have again been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,263,396 to Cottle et al. Nowhere does Cottle et al. transfer OSD data between memories. Rather, column 18, lines 33-40 indicate that the amount of memory in SDRAM 312 which may be allocated to OSD may be expanded by putting the VBV buffer in optional

memory on extension bus 300, so as to free up memory available in SDRAM 312 for OSD. It is therefore clear that Cottle et al. do not teach or suggest transfer of OSD data between memories, as specifically recited in Claims 1 and 6. Rather, Cottle et al transfer other data so that OSD data is not transferred to another memory.

The Examiner has pointed out that Cottle et al. stores OSD window attributes on RAM 240. However, nowhere do Cottle et al. teach or suggest the storage of OSD *data* anywhere but on SDRAM 312. Since Claims 1 and 6 specifically recite transfer of on-screen display *data* from a first memory to a second memory, it is clear that the patent to Cottle et al. does not affect the patentability of Claims 1 and 6.

The Examiner has asserted that it would be obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art to move any data including OSD data from one memory to another. The Applicants can not agree. Such a modification of Cottle et al. would be contrary to the clear teachings of the patent. Cottle et al. clearly teach that other data in SDRAM 312 may be moved to another memory in order to free up space for OSD memory. See column 18, lines 33-40. It is therefore clear that any transfer of OSD data from one memory to another would be contrary to the clear teachings of Cottle et al.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 10 and 11 are dependent from Claim 1 and set forth further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent claim.

Claims 7-9 are dependent from Claim 6 and set forth further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent claim.

The Applicants believe that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Edouard Ritz et al.

By: *Catherine A. Ferguson*
Catherine A. Ferguson
Reg. No. 40,877
Tel. No. (609)734-6440

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
28 February 2006